



Resource mobilization for Gender-Responsive Breeding

This brief describes a strategy and work packages for the CGIAR Gender and Breeding Initiative (GBI) towards achieving the Initiative's aim of enabling plant and animal breeding programs to be more gender-responsive.

The Pitch – Selling the Strategy

A persuasive case needs to be developed for investing in gender-responsive plant and animal breeding. In order to capture and leverage the interest of potential donors and other stakeholders, this should focus on the “pain points” associated with not promoting the adoption of gender-responsive breeding approaches and decision making. One such pain point, for example, would be limited adoption of improved plant varieties in key African food systems due to a failure to accurately and adequately consider end user perspectives in conducting breeding research. The entry point to resource mobilization in this instance would be the potential benefits of gender-responsive breeding for scaling up the adoption of improved varieties.

Project Work Packages

Six project work packages support effective resource mobilization:

1) WP 1: Evidence – It must be clearly demonstrated that gender-responsive breeding matters, in terms of improved productivity, scaling up adoption, and positive impacts on equity (the latter through comparative impact studies, with and without gender

integration in breeding programs). This evidence base must be both clear and compelling, and accompanied by: the design of an effective statistical framework; the identification of near-term opportunities (“low hanging fruit”) for potential interventions; methodologies for avoiding confirmation bias; and systematic post-mortem analyses of poor or failed adoption.

2) WP 2: Advocacy – An advocacy approach that is closely linked to the key elements of the GBI Uptake Pathways strategy is needed (see Brief 2 ‘Uptake Pathways to Achieve Gender-Responsive Breeding’). Advocacy for gender-responsive breeding should, at least in part, focus on avoiding the “pain” of non-adoption and continued gender inequity. Advocacy should also focus on the positives – increased technology adoption, higher productivity, and greater gender equity – assuming that compelling evidence about the benefits of gender-responsive breeding can be provided. A set of case studies being developed by the Initiative will help provide this evidence.

3) WP 3: Development and Validation of a Decision Checklist for Gender-Responsive Breeding – The

* This brief was based on the group work during the Innovation in Gender-Responsive Breeding Workshop of: Chiedozi Egesi (IITA/Cornell University), Cu Thi Le Thuy (CIAT), Bela Teeken (IITA), Graham Thiele (RTB-PMU), Hale Ann Tufan (Cornell University), Hugo Campos (CIP), Juliet Kariuki (ILRI), Rhiannon Pyburn (KIT/gender platform), Seamus Murphy (WorldFish), Thokozile Ndhlela (CIMMYT), Vivian Polar (RTB-PMU)



development and testing of a decision checklist aimed at fully integrating gender considerations into plant and animal breeding programs is of vital importance. This checklist should be piloted within several ongoing or planned breeding programs and evaluated for their utility and effectiveness. In addition, GBI (working with others) should assess what it takes to implement gender-responsive breeding programs at the institutional, team, and individual scientist levels. Big Data approaches should be considered for use in validating the effectiveness of gender-responsive breeding.

4) WP 4: Community of Practice – An active gender in breeding Community of Practice (CoP) currently exists and could take on different activities in resource mobilization, including the following:

- Developing and curating a library of well-designed case studies about successful gender-responsive breeding, as well as the impacts associated with a failure to adopt this approach
- Producing a gender-responsive breeding toolkit
Establishing a helpdesk and virtual discussion forum for sharing ideas and raising issues
Delineating a “roadmap” and entry points for integrating GBI strategies into other relevant platforms, e.g. the CGIAR Platform for Collaborative Gender Research, the CGIAR Excellence in Breeding Platform, the CGIAR Platform for Big Data in Agriculture

5) WP 5: Capacity building – Ideally the current gender and breeding Post-Doctoral Fellows (PDFs) program should continue, and that capacity building should be broadened to include additional PDFs and students. One idea that may be of interest to potential donors would be the pairing of gender scientists and breeders, embedded in breeding programs but associated through GBI as a means of integrating and linking their work.

6) WP 6: Management – Project management is particularly important as well, going beyond usual administrative activities to include the development of innovative decision-making procedures that are mapped across the establishment of breeding priorities. Project management should also entail the development of monitoring and evaluation methods suitable for the Initiative, along with an “institutional scorecard” for gauging gender responsiveness.

Options for Project Design

Option 1: The first option would involve providing the full gender-responsive breeding package associated with the breeding cycle of each targeted program. This would include a needs assessment, baseline development, piloting, developing the capacity of PDFs involved in target programs, and monitoring and evaluation.

Option 2: The second option would take a piecemeal approach to choosing different stages for gender-responsive breeding based on selective bids. The period of support could be for three years. For example, one activity could be focusing breeding research using segmentation, targeting and positioning (STP) methods; a second activity could focus on setting breeding objectives and economically valuing traits to establish breeding priorities; a third could focus on participatory varietal selection (PVS); and a fourth on product delivery and feedback.

Pilot the Advocacy Strategy

The advocacy strategy must go through a pilot stage to ensure that the approach being taken is a good fit with the audiences being targeted. Piloting the advocacy strategy will reveal what resonates with potential donors and enable adjustments to be made as needed.

Contact:

Holly Holmes
Communications Specialist, RTB
h.holmes@cgiar.org